REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1-21 are pending. By this Amendment claims 1, 4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17 and 18 are amended in order to make explicit that which was implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the July 23, 2007 personal interview. The substance of the discussions held are incorporated into the amendments and remarks herein and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,154,755 to Dellert et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,069,715 to Wang, claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dellert and Wang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,680,226 to Takayanagi, claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dellert, Wang and Takayanagi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,331 to Parry, claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dellert and Wang and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,590 to Saukkonen and claims 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dellert in view of Takayanagi. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing device including an image reader for reading a document image. The read image data is registered with a destination in a recording media. A detector detects a reading condition in reading the document image. The reading condition includes data related to the destination. An

extractor extracts a specific image data from the image data. A generator generates an index data including the specific image data and a reading condition data. The reading condition data includes the data related to the destination. A printer prints the index data including the data related to the destination.

Claim 8 is directed to an image data handling system including, *inter alia*, a transmitting device for transmitting index data to a printing device. A printing device includes a receiving device for receiving the index data.

Claim 10 is directed to an image data handling system including, *inter alia*, an image input device and a data processing device. The data processing device includes a receiving device for receiving the image data and the reading condition data, an extractor, a generator and a transmitting device for transmitting generated image data to the image input device.

Claim 12 is directed to, *inter alia*, a program stored on a computer readable medium. Claim 17 is directed to, *inter alia*, an image data handling method and claim 18 is directed to, *inter alia*, an image data handling device.

With respect to independent claims 1, 8, 10, 12 and 17, neither Dellert nor Wang, disclose or suggest printing data including the data related to the destination. With respect to claim 18, neither Dellert nor Wang, disclose or suggest an output device that outputs the index data including the data related to the destination. The Examiner relies on Dellert for allegedly teaching a generator for generating an index data including specific image data and a reading condition data including the data related to the destination and a printer for printing this index data. However, Dellert discloses that images are formed into an array which is sent to an index printer 16 which produces an index print 18 having an array of index images 20. An index print

of the images may be printed on a label 28. The Office Action asserts that the reading condition data including the data related to the destination is disclosed in Dellert at column 5, lines 31-37. However, this portion of Dellert merely discloses that a category list and image object list 202, 204 are saved in the index file Album.IDX. Dellert does not disclose that this category list and image object list are printed. Thus what the Office Action alleges is equivalent to the destination is not printed. As discussed at column 6, lines 23-37 of Dellert, the image title 162 may be printed as well as the time stamp 164. No data is printed that relates to the destination.

The Office Action relies on Wang to provide an image reader for reading a document image. Thus, Wang does not provide the deficiencies of Dellert.

For explanatory purposes Applicant provides the following non-limiting example described in the specification beginning at paragraph 47. Destination data may be for example //copier01/guest/doc1.tif. As shown in Figure 5 the printed index data includes the recitation of a destination data. This allows a user to easily identify image data stored in a storage device without causing any increase of workload. This feature is not disclosed in Dellert.

As discussed above Dellert does not disclose the feature of printing the destination data. Furthermore, the Examiner has not provided a reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have included this feature in Dellert.

Likewise with respect to dependent claims 3 and 13, which recite that the reading condition data includes at least one of the items of document size, number of pages, reading mode, resolution, and image quality data, the Office Action merely cites Takayanagi as disclosing these features while ignoring the recitation in

independent claims 1 and 12, from which claims 3 and 13 respectively depend, that the reading condition data is printed. Furthermore, the Examiner provides no motivation why one of ordinary skill would print the reading condition data recited in claims 3 and 13. Likewise, with respect to claims 4 and 14 wherein the destination data is defined by the name of an image data file and claim 5 wherein the destination data is defined by a URL, the Examiner provides no motivation why one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to print the destination data defined by dependent claims 4, 14 and 5.

Takayanagi, Parry and Saukkonen did not provide the deficiencies of Dellert and Wang described above.

The remaining dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims as well as for the individual features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Examiner is respectfully urged to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>July 30, 2007</u>   By: _____

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47260

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620

#1193206-v1